

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, SENATE SUPPLEMENTARY DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS APRIL 30, 1996—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Farm Credit System Regulatory Relief Act (P.L. 104-105)	-1	-1
National Defense Authorization Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-106)	369	367
Extension of Certain Expiring Authorities of the Department of Veterans Affairs (P.L. 104-110) To award Congressional Gold Medal to Ruth and Billy Graham (P.L. 104-111)	-5	-5
An Act Providing for Tax Benefits for Armed Forces in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Croatia and Macedonia (P.L. 104-117)	(*)	(*)
Contract with America Advancement Act (P.L. 104-121)	-120	-6
Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act (P.L. 94-127)	-325	-744
Federal Tea Tasters Repeal Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-128)	(*)
Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (P.L. 104-132)	2
Total enacted second session	292,699	201,740	-36
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	11,913	13,951
Total Current Level ⁴	1,301,058	1,302,495	1,042,421
Total Budget Resolution	1,285,500	1,288,100	1,042,500
Amount remaining:			
Under Budget Resolution	79
Over Budget Resolution	15,558	14,395

¹P.L. 104-99 provides funding for specific appropriated accounts until September 30, 1996.

²This bill, also referred to as the sixth continuing resolution for 1996, provides funding until September 30, 1996 for specific appropriated accounts.

³The effects of this Act on budget authority, outlays, and revenues begin in fiscal year 1997.

⁴In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$4,547 million in budget authority and \$2,399 million in outlays for funding of emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress.

* Less than \$500,000.

Notes: Detail may not add due to rounding.

RECOGNIZING DR. PAUL KREIDER FOR HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND YEARS OF GOOD SERVICE

• Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this June, Dr. Paul Kreider will be retiring from his position as president of Mount Hood Community College in Gresham, OR. I would like to recognize Dr. Kreider for his exceptional accomplishments and leadership during his many years of service.

Through strategic planning, program review and improvement, staff and organizational development, management information systems, and participatory decisionmaking, Dr. Kreider has played a significant role in the successful development of Mount Hood Community College. His effectiveness as a leader has not gone unnoticed; Dr. Kreider has received a number of awards, among them the National Council for Research and Planning 1991 Management Recognition Award, the National ACCT Marie Y. Martin CEO of the Year Award, and the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development Leadership Award.

Dr. Kreider's leadership did not stop at the doors of Mount Hood Community College; he has extended his knowledge and expertise to others in the community as well. In particular,

he founded and chaired the Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success in the Community College, an American Association Community Colleges-affiliated consortium. Additionally, he reached out to assist other community colleges in developing assessment tools to measure student outcomes, strategic planning, and program improvement.

Dr. Kreider remains quite active on State, national, and international levels. In the past, he served as president of the Board of Education Partners for International Cooperation, Inc. and the Oregon Community College Presidents' Council. Presently, he sits on the boards of several organizations including the American Association of Community Colleges and Community Colleges for International Development, Inc.

Again, I would like to both pay tribute to Dr. Kreider and congratulate him for his accomplishments and contributions to the educational community. Mount Hood Community College, as well as Oregon at large, has most certainly benefited from his initiative and leadership. I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID IFSHIN

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today, we laid to rest a dear friend of mine, and of many of my colleagues, David Ifshin. His family honored me by inviting me to be among the eulogists at David's funeral. I want to include in the RECORD a copy of my remarks so that those many Americans who review our proceedings will know that a good and much loved man and an authentic American patriot has been lost to us.

I ask that those remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

EULOGY FOR DAVID IFSHIN BY SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

It has become a common appeal of eulogists for the bereaved to celebrate the life rather than mourn the passing of the loved one to whom we bid goodbye. It is a hopeful and well-intended appeal. Gathering in sorrow is not, I suspect, what David Ifshin would have us do on this occasion. But he was such a lovely guy, and his company such a blessing, that the loss of him is a great weight which only a word from David could lift from my heart today.

Yet, the sadness of this day will not long intrude on our memories of David; memories which illuminate for me a way to live my own life. As we grow older, we all learn how brief a moment life is. David's was far too brief, but he filled his moment with so much passion and love and with such a ceaseless striving for grace that it would exhaust the lives of lesser men who manage to stay among us for more years than David could. Few people, having reached the end of a long life, will have done as much good, lived with grater dignity, deserved more honor, bestowed more love, traveled as far as David Ifshin did in his forty-seven years.

David had an uncommon capacity for personal growth. When I was in his company, I always had a sense that David derived much of his own happiness from discovering virtue in others. And I believe those discoveries

made him grow. They nourished his own humanity.

David was a patriot because he found, as all patriots must, virtue in his country's cause. He always felt passionate about his country. But when we are young our passion is not always governed by wisdom gained from long experience, and, thus, is often indiscriminate in the emotions it animates. While living in Israel David discovered his country's virtue, and his love of country became the object of his enlightened passion.

David also possessed an animating love of justice. He worked to make our society more just, and he sought justice for those who were not blessed to live in this country. Even more importantly, he always tried in his personal relationships to do justice to others. And that explains why, no matter where his reason and his love took him, David never left a friend behind.

We friends of David are cast across the spectrum of contemporary American politics. Some may think that David and I became friends because David's political views became more compatible with my own. That is not really true. My regard for David is more personal than political affinity. We remained partisans in different camps. What David taught me, and, I suspect, what he taught a great many people, was how narrow are the differences that separate us in a society united in its regard for justice, in a country in love with liberty.

In this town, we accentuate our political differences to advance our respective agendas and our professional ambitions. David kept such things in perspective. He was loyal to his political beliefs, but he pledged a greater devotion to the bonds of friendship and love that connected him to so many people of diverse backgrounds, creeds and aspirations.

He was extraordinarily generous in his regard for others' virtues, and self-effacing in considering his own attributes. Because of that capacity, I always felt in David's company that I was in the presence of a better man.

Regrettably, it was not human virtue, but human weakness which created the occasion for me to publicly declare my personal regard for David. Some people who did not know David based their judgment of his character in their resentment over one brief episode in David's life. I am ashamed to admit that I once made the same mistake. My subsequent discovery of David's true character taught me to refrain in future from using snapshots of another's life as the full measure of a person's value. That was a valuable lesson to learn, and I am indebted to David for having taught it to me.

To honor that debt, I tried to impart the lesson to others who had rushed to a wrong judgment of David. Three years ago, I went to the Senate floor to respond to a protest at the Vietnam War Memorial. One of the protestors had held up a sign questioning David's patriotism and his association with the President. I wanted the protestors to know that they were bearing false witness against a good man. That this small gesture meant so much to David meant even more to me. David Ifshin was my friend, and his friendship honored me, and honors me still.

Most of the important and lasting friendships I have made in my life were formed in the shared experience of war. David and I did not fight a war together, but neither did we fight a war against each other. We chose instead to make a peace together.

I found little to differentiate the quality of our friendship from the quality of those that were begun in Vietnam. I learned about courage, honor and kindness from all my friendships. From David, I learned to look for virtue in others, and I also learned the futility

of looking back in anger. I'm a better man for the experience.

I think that as David approached the closing of his life he could look back with pride, and with gratitude, that his life was not distinguished by its brevity, but by its richness, by the love of his beautiful family, and by the tender regard in which he was held by so many people who knew a good man when they saw him. We are all better people for having been blessed by David Ifshin's friendship.

Gail, Jake, Ben and Chloe, Mr. and Mrs. Ifshin, thank you for so generously sharing David with the rest of us. Please know that the day will arrive when your deep hurt subsides, when the memory of David, and the bright and gentle moments you shared with him lifts your hearts again. He will be with you always.●

COMMERCE SECRETARY RONALD H. BROWN

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, as we return to session today it is spring in Washington. The blossoms are out. It is a beautiful time, and yet I am sure the experience I had in flying back with my family yesterday was similar to what others returning yesterday experienced: It brought home the terrible tragedy that occurred while we were away—the plane that went down in Croatia carrying Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown and so many others. It filled me with a sense of loss again yesterday and today.

I am proud that I had the chance to work with Ron Brown during his all too short tenure at the Commerce Department. I enjoyed working with Ron Brown at various stages of his career—as an attorney, as a leading Democratic activist, as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and most closely and, I think, most creatively in these last 3 years as Secretary of Commerce. I am honored that I can call him a friend. We are all going to miss him—it's painful to think that my staff and I won't have the sheer fun of working with him again—and the country will miss him even more. I have the greatest respect for him, as have so many others, as a wonderful, warm human being and as a leader who had a clear-eyed vision of how to make our people and our country better.

You never think of a man in the prime of life not being here. In a way, it is death that forces you to appreciate even more the great skills and the service that Ron Brown, displayed for our benefit.

Ron Brown truly loved the job he had at Commerce. He always managed to fit himself well to the tasks he undertook, wherever he was, but this job really did fit him like a glove, from the moment he took it. He understood as soon as he started the job that the mission of the Department of Commerce is to promote economic growth, that it is job creation. He understood from his own experience the wide-open nature of our market system and that the market and its upward mobility was the unique way America had for creating opportunity for its citizens.

Ron Brown never saw the business community as an enemy, he saw it as an ally in expanding opportunity, and he threw himself into this job with a single-mindedness and joyous commitment to moving the system, the economic system, so that it would deliver for all Americans.

Against this background, I want to talk about two efforts he spent his time on at Commerce that I think were critical. I believe that they were truly extraordinary, and set a new performance standard for our Government's relationship with the private sector.

EXPORTS

The first has been written about extensively in the days since his death, and even over the preceding 3 years: The incredible export promotion operation he put together at Commerce. But I do not think that enough has been said about why it was so important.

Until the mid-1970's, the United States economy was on top of the world, dominating it. While our economic rivals, led particularly by Japan, were figuring out that selling advanced manufactured goods for export was the key to economic growth and raising the living standards of people back home, our Government was coasting on our success. We were not paying attention to the emerging economic message.

Other countries built export promotion machines—and they were machines—through the most intimate and comprehensive alliances between business and government, the private sector and the public sector. But our Government paid too little attention to the need to build these alliances. American businesses—and I heard this repeatedly from business executives in Connecticut—would go abroad to compete, and they would see what the business-government alliances of our competitors were doing for export promotion.

I remember being told a story by the executive of one of the companies in Connecticut; his firm was competing against two other companies, one from Asia and one from Europe, for a very large order in a foreign country. He went over there to participate in simultaneous bidding among the three business competitors. This company from Connecticut, a big company, had its executives and lawyers in one room. But in the other two rooms, the executives and representatives of the Asian company and of the European company were teamed up with a representative of the Asian government and of the European government, respectively. The government representatives were combining with their companies to enhance their firms' offers. It made the contest unequal. The Connecticut company did not get the contract. We lost an opportunity and jobs.

The State Department, I am afraid, continued to treat American business as if it had to be held at arm's length. Too many administrations went along

with that distant attitude. Preoccupied with the end of the cold war and retaining the political alliances required for it, the State Department embraced a traditional and outmoded notion of what foreign policy was all about, of what mattered to people here at home. It missed what was happening in both the world economy and the American economy, which has been a grave error. It made export promotion a low priority, while our rivals made it the top priority. The State Department treated U.S. business like pariahs, it was "Upstairs-Downstairs"—trade was beneath our diplomatic priorities.

This hasn't ended. A Business Week editorial this week notes that, "The U.S. foreign policy and security elite believe security should be divorced from economic issues. Some go so far as to suggest that providing security is a perk of global power." It concludes, "We don't. American workers can't be expected to suffer economically to protect [other nations] from one another." Ron Brown shared this view, and he was the new momentum for bringing our economy into foreign relations. The President was his staunch ally on this effort, and helped him force change in this area.

Ron Brown, working with President Clinton, understood that we had to create a central position in our foreign policy for our economic policy. Export promotion had to be at the core of our international outreach. It was not a bad thing, but, in fact, it was a very good thing, if the President visited a foreign country with the Secretary of Commerce and the issues they discussed with the leadership of that foreign country included buying American goods.

I come from a very export-oriented State. In fact, it has the highest level of exports per capita of any State in the country. We know that exports create jobs, high-paying manufacturing jobs, and that each manufacturing job has an economic multiplier effect, creating a chain of goods and services behind it, longer by far than other types of jobs.

The sad fact is that we have been disinvesting in manufacturing since the mid-1970s, even though we need these kinds of jobs more than ever to develop a strong economy and a better standard of living for our people which will continue America as the land of opportunity. Ron Brown, as Secretary of Commerce, understood this from the beginning of his service.

When he began his export promotion effort, within days of arriving at the Commerce Department, the leaders of the American business community that I spoke to—and I particularly heard this from heads of firms in Connecticut—were in disbelief. Someone was finally paying attention to their priorities. Somebody was finally trying to help them pull together an American governmental countermovement to the vast efforts rival countries and their businesses had been mounting for decades, to take jobs and exports away